DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 460 UD 012 297

AUTHOR Sedlacek, William E.; Brooks, Glenwood C., Jr.
TITLE Differences in Racial Attitudes of White Males and Females.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
REPORT NO RR-2-72
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 15p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Tests; Bias; *Caucasian Students; *College Students; Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; Racism; *Sex Differences; Situational Tests; Social Attitudes; *Southern Attitudes; Southern Schools
IDENTIFIERS Maryland; Situational Attitude Scale

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of 1114 white university students toward blacks were compared by sex, using the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). The SAS contains 10 personal or social situations where race might be a variable in reacting to the situations. For each situation, ten bipolar Semantic Differential scales were written. The SAS was administered anonymously to University of Maryland students in classrooms or attending freshman orientation programs. Students were asked to indicate sex, class, and college of enrollment. Results of analyses of variance indicated that whites generally respond negatively to blacks in most situations except those removed from close personal contact. White females tend to react negatively to situations where potential fear of physical harm or sexual contact is involved, and particularly negatively to blacks in the rape situation. The positivity or negativity of the items was based on previously reported factor analyses and correlations. The results of this study strongly support the independence of the situations in regard to race and sex. The answer to the question "What are the attitudes of whites toward blacks?" seems to depend greatly on the context in which the question is asked and to some extent on the sex of the respondent. (Authors/JM)

ED 062460

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL ATTITUDES OF WHITE MALES AND FEMALES

William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 2-72

UD 012297

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL ATTITUDES OF WHITE MALES AND FEMALES

William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 2-72

SUMMARY

The attitudes of 1114 white university students toward blacks were compared by sex, using the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). Results of 2 way analyses of variance indicated that whites generally respond negatively to blacks in most situations except those removed from close personal contact. White females tend to react negatively to situations where potential fear of physical harm or sexual contact is involved (e.g., man raped woman; man selling magazines at your door in the evening; passing a corner of loitering men) and particularly negatively to blacks in the rape situation. The supposed extraordinary sexuality of blacks and particularly feelings surrounding sexual relations between white women and black men have been considered by a number of writers to be at the basis of race relations in the United States. The writers conclude that the answer to the question "What are the attitudes of whites toward blacks?" seems to depend greatly on the context in which the question is asked and to some extent on the sex of the respondent.

Differences in racial attitudes of white males and females have been explored relatively little and the results appear inconclusive. Females have often been found to be more concerned with helping others and general social interests (e.g., American Council on Education, 1971; Collins and Sedlacek, 1971). Some studies have found white females to have more negative attitudes toward blacks and other racial or ethnic minorities than do white males (e.g., Bogardus, 1959; Proenza and Strickland, 1965; and Sayler, 1969). Other studies have shown no significant differences in racial attitudes between white males and females (e.g., Bogardus, 1959; Proenza and Strickland, 1965; Sheatsley, 1966; Caffrey, Anderson and Garrison, 1969; American Council on Education, 1971; Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971). Additionally, some studies have shown that white women have more favorable racial attitudes than white men (Stein, 1966; Creager, 1971). In the studies cited above there were many different ways of measuring racial attitudes across many samples. Variability of method undoubtedly serves to cloud the issue of sex differences in racial attitudes. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970) have summarized the methodological problems in measuring the attitudes of whites toward blacks as (a) lack of contemporary content in existing measures, (b) lack of validity information for measurement scale, and (c) inadequate assessment techniques to measure social reinforcement for being tolerant or positive toward blacks. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) demonstrated that the insertion of the word "black" into a social or personal situation caused subjects (*S*s) to respond differently and generally more negatively than if race were not mentioned. They attempted to avoid the measurement problems noted above in their Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) by using contemporary situations and terminology, by providing validity evidence and by using a technique which apparently relied on the fact that half of the *S*s were unaware that racial attitudes were being measured. In a separate study (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971) they found a discrepancy between

what white university students felt were socially acceptable attitudes toward blacks and how they felt themselves, indicating a strong social set to be tolerant.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a; 1972a,b), Brooks and Sedlacek (1970, 1971) and Chaples, Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) provided evidence on the complexity of racial attitudes across specific situations. Thus the context within which one measures racial attitudes is very important. The purpose of this study was to clarify the relationship between sex and racial attitudes in a controlled study.

Method

The SAS as developed by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) was used in the current study. The SAS contains 10 personal or social situations where race might be a variable in reacting to the situations (see Table 1). For each situation ten bipolar Semantic Differential scales were written (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957) making a total of 100 items in the SAS (see Table 2). Two forms of the SAS were developed. Each contains the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions except the word black was inserted into Form B. Form A makes no mention of race. The positive pole for each item was varied randomly from left to right to avoid response set. The SAS was administered anonymously to University of Maryland students in classrooms or attending freshman orientation programs. Students were asked to indicate sex, class and college of enrollment. The response sheets of black students were noted as they were turned in and were not analyzed in this study. In all cases Forms A and B were distributed randomly to intact groups, thus each *S* had an approximately equal chance of receiving either Form A or Form B. Final usable *N*'s were: Form A male, 342; Form A female, 225; Form B male, 336; Form B female, 211; due to six *S*s refusing to participate in the study, 62 leaving more than 10% of the responses blank, and the elimination

of 27 black students from the sample. The sample was 2/3 freshman but otherwise represented a diverse and fairly representative cross-section of the student body on ratio of males to females, and college. Due to random assignment of *S*s within intact groups, there were no significant differences on any of the above characteristics between forms. Data were analyzed by analysis of variance (fixed effects - .01 level) with Form (A or B) and Sex (M or F) as main effects.

Results

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for each subgroup and significant *F* tests. Results indicated that 59 of the 100 items were significantly different on Form, 66 were significant on Sex and 12 were significant on the interaction of Form and Sex. Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) indicate that one would expect only 4 or 5 tests to be significant at .01 level by chance out of 100 conducted, so the two main effects are highly significant and the interaction is slightly above chance.

On Form, *S*s tended to be more negative on Form B in eight of the ten situations, particularly situations I (new family next door) and V (friend becomes engaged). This indicates that white *S*s held generally negative attitudes toward blacks in those situations. On situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by policeman), however, whites responded more positively to blacks in the situation than if there were no mention of race (Form A).

On Sex, females tended to hold more positive attitudes than males in situations I (new family next door), V (friend becomes engaged), VII (person joins social group) and VIII (youngster steals). Males, however, tended to hold more positive attitudes than females to situations II (man raped woman), III (man selling magazines) and IV (corner of loitering men).

Five of the 12 significant interactions occurred in items in situation II (man raped woman). These five interactions were the reversal type where females tended to be positive on Form A and more negative on Form B, and males tended to be negative on Form A and more positive on Form B.

Discussion

The finding that whites generally respond more negatively to blacks and the pattern of the most negative responses to the social situations of a new black family next door and a friend becoming engaged to a black is consistent with the previous findings of Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a, 1972b) and Brooks and Sedlacek (1970, 1971). Also consistent with the above studies is the finding that whites respond more positively to blacks as magazine salesmen and policemen than they do if race is not mentioned. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970, p.979) summarize a hypothetical modal *S*'s response as "It's OK to have blacks sell me magazines or be policemen but they had better not move next door or get engaged to any of my friends."

However, when sex is concurrently examined, a number of additional explanations and interpretations become relevant. Situation II (man raped woman) did not generate much negative feeling in the studies cited above or in the present study (items 13 and 19) when responses were not grouped by sex. However, females reacted strongly negatively to the items in situation II, particularly when a black man raped a white woman, as evidenced by the interaction of Form and Sex for items 12, 13 and 14. Thus, when male and female responses to situation II are pooled they tend to cancel each other out and differences are masked. Additionally, when the female negative attitudes to a man selling magazines at your door in the evening, and to men loitering on the corner are considered, an

explanation of female fear of physical harm or rape might be offered. These situations appear to generate unique attitudes among females. It is also possible that a theme of sexual contact runs through the situations, which has long been a popular racial stereotype in the United States. The supposed extraordinary sexuality of blacks and particularly feelings surrounding sexual relations between white women and black men have been considered by a number of writers to be at the basis of race relations in this country (e.g., Allport, 1958; Cleaver, 1968; Grier and Cobbs, 1968). The issue of a direct link between sexual situations and racial attitudes is one that needs to be explored further empirically.

Females tended to respond more positively than males to situations I (new family next door), V (friend becomes engaged), VI (stopped by policeman), VII (person joins social group) and VIII (youngster steals). It could be that the "public nature" of these social situations negates the one-to-one personal contact and any potential consequences of physical harm or sexual contact. Here again the sex of the respondent is important in assessing reactions to the situations. Of particular interest is the difference in female reactions to situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by policeman) compared to those of males. These have been interpreted by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) as involving social roles thought of as "appropriate" for blacks, which they feel accounts for the positive attitudes held toward blacks in those situations. However, females tend to be relatively negative about the magazine salesman in the evening and positive about the policeman. Again the plausibility of a physical harm dimension appears and again it is likely the situations are viewed differently by males and females. Males may see these two as social role situations while females may see a threat of physical harm in the magazine salesman and safety in the policeman.

Several methodological points should be noted. First, the positivity or negativity of the items was based on factor analyses and correlations reported by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b). Second, the situations of the SAS were discussed rather than items since Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b) have reported the relative independence of the situations and the relative unimportance of the exact words used in the bipolar items. A general good-bad association appears to be the primary stimulus in the items. The results of this study also strongly support the independence of the situations in regard to both Form (race) and Sex. The answer to the question "What are the attitudes of whites toward blacks?" seems to depend greatly on the context in which the question is asked and to some extent on the sex of the respondent.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W.
1958 *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

American Council on Education.
1971 *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1971*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Bogardus, E. S.
1959 "Race Reaction by Sexes." *Sociology and Social Research* 43 (July-August): 439-441.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., and W. E. Sedlacek.
1970 "An Experimental Study of Differential Reactions of Whites Toward Negroes and Blacks." *American Psychological Association Proceedings* 5: 359-360.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., and W. E. Sedlacek.
1971 "Choice of Racial Referent as a Variable in Racial Attitude Measurement." *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 5-71*. University of Maryland.

Caffrey, B., S. Anderson, and J. Garrison.
1969 "Change in Racial Attitudes of White Southerners After Exposure to the Atmosphere of a Southern University." *Psychological Reports* 25 (October): 555-558.

Chaples, E. A., W. E. Sedlacek, and G. C. Brooks, Jr.
1972 "Measuring Prejudicial Attitudes in a Situational Context: A Report on a Danish Experiment." *Scandinavian Political Studies* (in press).

Cleaver, E.
1968 *Soul on Ice*. New York: Dell.

Collins, A. M., and W. E. Sedlacek
1971 "Satisfied and Dissatisfied Users of Holland's Self Directed Search (SDS)." *Counseling Center Research Report # 5-71*. University of Maryland.

Creager, J. A.
1971 *The American Graduate Student: A Normative Description*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Greeley, A. M., and P. B. Sheatsley.
1971 "Attitudes Toward Racial Integration." *Scientific American* 225 (December): 13-19.

Grier, W. H., and P. M. Cobbs.
1968 *Black Rage*. New York: Bantam.

Osgood, C. E., G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum.
1957 *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Proenza, L., and B. R. Strickland.
1965 "A Study of Prejudice in Negro and White College Students." *Journal of Social Psychology* 67 (October): 273-281.

Sakoda, J. M., B. H. Cohen, and G. Beall.
1954 "Tests of Significance for a Series of Statistical Tests." *Psychological Bulletin* 51 (March): 172-175.

Sayler, R. I.
1969 "An Exploration of Race Prejudice in College Students and Interracial Contact." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 30, 6A, 2620.

Sedlacek, W. E., and G. C. Brooks, Jr.
1970a "Measuring Racial Attitudes in a Situational Context." *Psychological Reports* 27 (December): 971-980.

1970b "The Development of a Measure of Racial Attitudes." *Experimental Publication System, American Psychological Association* MS #177C 5 (April).

1971 "Social Acceptability in the Measurement of Racial Attitudes." *Psychological Reports* 29 (August): 17-18.

1972a "Racial Attitudes, Authoritarianism and Dogmatism Among University Students." *College Student Journal* (in press).

1972b "Race as an Experimenter Effect in Racial Attitude Measurement." *Psychological Reports* (in press).

Sheatsley, P. B.
1966 "White Attitudes Toward the Negro." *Daedalus* 95 (Winter): 217-237.

Stein, D. C.
1966 "The Influence of Belief Systems on Interpersonal Preference: A Validation Study of Rokeach's Theory of Prejudice." *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 80.

TABLE 1

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

	FORM A	FORM B
I.	A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.
II.	You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.
III.	It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five your black men are loitering.
V.	Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.
VI.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.
VII.	A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.
VIII.	You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.
IX.	Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.
X.	You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

*The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from the authors on request.

TABLE 2

Means,* Standard Deviations and Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	MALE FORM A(N=342) MEAN	MALE FORM A(N=342) S.D.	MALE FORM B(N=336) MEAN	MALE FORM B(N=336) S.D.	FEMALE FORM A(N=225) MEAN	FEMALE FORM A(N=225) S.D.	FEMALE FORM B(N=211) MEAN	FEMALE FORM B(N=211) S.D.	DIFFERENCES SIGNIFICANT AT .01 ***
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR									
1	good-bad	1.22	0.91	1.80	1.01	0.91	0.86	1.46	0.99	F, S
2	safe-unsafe	1.13	0.91	1.37	1.06	0.85	0.88	0.94	0.97	F, S
3	angry-not angry	3.35	1.00	2.94	1.19	3.69	0.81	3.33	1.06	F, S
4	friendly-unfriendly	0.88	0.86	1.06	1.00	0.66	0.80	0.83	0.91	F, S
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	1.60	1.04	1.89	1.24	1.35	1.23	1.78	1.32	F
6	nervous-calm	2.77	1.17	2.63	1.18	3.08	1.10	2.80	1.19	F, S
7	happy-sad	1.43	0.83	1.91	0.97	1.14	0.87	1.54	1.03	F, S
8	objectionable-acceptable	3.07	0.96	2.76	1.26	3.36	0.86	3.14	1.18	F, S
9	desirable-undesirable	1.45	0.87	1.91	1.09	1.20	0.90	1.59	1.17	F, S
10	suspicious-trusting	2.53	0.97	2.35	1.11	2.96	0.94	2.94	1.06	S
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN									
11	affection-disgust	3.39	0.83	3.50	0.80	3.70	0.63	3.64	0.67	S
12	relish-repulsion	3.26	0.86	3.40	0.80	3.70	0.65	3.60	0.69	S, F x S
13	happy-sad	3.26	0.85	3.53	0.77	3.72	0.64	3.67	0.63	F, S, F x S
14	friendly-hostile	3.02	0.90	3.10	0.89	3.32	0.81	3.10	0.89	S, F x S
15	uninvolved-involved	1.69	1.29	1.98	1.25	2.07	1.38	1.98	1.25	S
16	hope-hopelessness	2.07	1.11	2.23	1.07	2.28	1.10	2.32	1.07	
17	aloof-outraged	2.37	0.98	2.52	1.05	2.71	0.98	2.54	0.91	S, F x S
18	injure-kill	1.53	1.11	1.55	1.19	1.33	1.21	1.28	1.11	S
19	safe-fearful	1.78	1.20	2.12	1.12	2.83	1.11	2.65	1.03	F, S, F x S
20	empathetic-can't understand	2.11	1.21	2.36	1.23	2.30	1.23	2.48	1.21	
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES									
21	relaxed-startled	1.67	1.14	1.70	1.23	2.36	1.11	2.10	1.28	F, S
22	receptive-cautious	2.72	1.07	2.32	1.31	3.26	0.91	2.64	1.23	F, S
23	excited-unexcited	3.00	1.06	2.56	1.05	2.87	1.13	2.46	1.16	F
24	glad-angered	2.38	0.69	2.09	0.64	2.34	0.61	2.09	0.59	F
25	pleased-annoyed	2.78	0.86	2.45	0.88	2.81	0.80	2.49	0.84	F
26	indifferent-suspicious	2.06	1.36	1.74	1.40	2.48	1.29	1.91	1.42	F, S
27	tolerable-intolerable	1.67	1.08	1.23	1.13	1.75	1.05	1.24	1.12	F
28	afraid-secure	2.64	0.99	2.42	1.07	1.69	1.04	1.93	1.18	S, F x S
29	friend-enemy	1.96	0.74	1.65	0.85	2.13	0.74	1.61	0.81	F
30	unprotected-protected	2.74	0.90	2.53	1.04	2.08	1.14	2.18	1.16	S

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)

** See Table 1 for complete situation.

*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete anova tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Means,* Standard Deviations and Results of Analyses of Variance
(continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) MEAN	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) S.D.	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) MEAN	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) S.D.	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) MEAN	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) S.D.	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) MEAN	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) S.D.	DIFFERENCES SIGNIFICANT AT .01***
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN									
31	relaxed-tensed	2.69	1.15	2.97	1.06	3.34	0.89	3.19	1.00	S, F x S
32	pleased-angered	2.23	0.55	2.31	0.74	2.33	0.71	2.19	0.57	F x S
33	superior-inferior	1.94	0.97	1.95	0.80	2.12	1.01	2.12	0.72	S
34	smarter-dumber	1.31	0.79	1.47	0.76	1.54	0.83	1.72	0.60	F, S
35	whiter-blacker	1.66	0.76	1.16	0.98	1.73	0.76	1.11	0.96	F
36	aggressive-passive	2.33	1.12	2.62	0.99	2.79	1.01	2.76	0.98	F, S
37	safe-unsafe	2.43	0.99	2.68	1.01	2.92	0.93	2.79	1.03	S, F x S
38	friendly-unfriendly	2.07	0.97	1.82	1.06	2.60	0.96	2.28	0.97	F, S
39	excited-unexcited	1.86	1.02	1.69	1.08	1.96	1.12	1.97	1.11	S
40	trivial-important	1.70	1.02	1.97	1.16	1.86	1.21	1.85	1.04	
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED									
41	aggressive-passive	1.88	1.22	2.28	1.27	1.27	1.14	2.37	1.13	F, S, F x S
42	happy-sad	0.76	0.99	1.91	1.38	0.38	0.81	1.56	1.36	F, S
43	tolerable-intolerable	0.64	0.87	1.32	1.33	0.30	0.65	0.86	1.15	F, S
44	complimented-insulted	1.03	0.92	1.95	1.05	0.82	0.94	1.69	0.93	F, S
45	angered-overjoyed	3.01	0.82	1.96	1.06	3.47	0.75	2.37	0.91	F
46	secure-fearful	1.10	1.06	1.48	1.15	1.04	1.05	1.36	1.22	F, S
47	hopeful-hopeless	0.80	0.90	1.52	1.29	0.47	0.76	1.03	1.22	F, S
48	excited-unexcited	1.02	0.92	1.67	1.12	0.31	0.62	1.36	1.12	F, S, F x S
49	right-wrong	1.08	0.99	1.90	1.38	0.75	0.98	1.37	1.29	F, S
50	disgusting-pleasing	3.23	0.91	2.09	1.26	3.65	0.73	2.47	1.12	F, S
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN									
51	calm-nervous	2.87	1.25	2.30	1.52	3.37	1.02	2.55	1.60	F, S
52	trusting-suspicious	2.00	1.22	1.12	1.10	1.88	1.28	0.75	0.98	F
53	afraid-safe	1.74	1.25	2.59	1.39	1.31	1.35	2.92	1.34	F, F x S
54	friendly-unfriendly	1.30	1.14	0.94	1.09	1.40	1.18	0.88	1.05	F
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.22	1.17	0.76	1.01	1.09	1.19	0.47	0.79	F, S
56	bitter-pleasant	2.14	1.20	2.56	1.22	2.36	1.14	2.97	1.05	F, S
57	cooperative-uncooperative	0.53	0.89	0.49	0.86	0.52	0.91	0.23	0.60	F
58	acceptive-belligerent	0.94	1.04	0.75	0.98	0.95	1.05	0.45	0.72	F
59	inferior-superior	1.88	0.90	1.85	0.74	1.55	1.00	1.76	0.70	S
60	smarter-dumber	1.76	0.86	1.88	0.73	2.09	0.91	2.03	0.54	S

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete anova tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

TABLE 2

Means,* Standard Deviations and Results of Analyses of Variance
(continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) MEAN	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) S.D.	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) MEAN	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) S.D.	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) MEAN	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) S.D.	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) MEAN	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) S.D.	DIFFERENCES SIGNIFICANT AT .01***
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP									
61	warm-cold	1.09	0.87	1.10	0.97	0.76	0.89	0.75	0.92	S
62	sad-happy	2.78	0.78	2.57	0.96	3.14	0.87	3.00	1.01	F, S
63	superior-inferior	1.64	0.65	1.84	0.52	1.70	0.67	1.95	0.36	F
64	threatened-neutral	3.14	1.07	3.34	1.02	3.23	1.08	3.63	0.80	F, S
65	pleased-displeased	1.19	0.84	1.45	1.05	0.79	0.79	1.00	1.03	F, S
66	understanding-indifferent	1.15	0.97	1.26	1.26	0.80	0.94	0.83	1.10	S
67	suspicious-trusting	2.56	0.94	2.79	1.06	2.96	0.91	3.23	0.90	F, S
68	disappointed-elated	2.43	0.71	2.26	0.88	2.63	0.71	2.54	0.87	F, S
69	favorable-unfavorable	1.17	0.86	1.29	1.18	0.76	0.84	0.81	1.01	S
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.73	1.01	2.71	1.17	2.89	1.04	3.04	1.11	S
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS									
71	surprising-not surprising	2.71	1.35	2.72	1.21	2.17	1.55	2.50	1.18	S
72	sad-happy	1.04	0.89	0.87	0.90	0.64	0.88	0.54	0.79	F, S
73	disinterested-interested	2.52	1.25	2.42	1.24	3.06	1.03	2.73	1.10	F, S
74	close-distant	1.99	1.16	2.17	1.25	1.78	1.25	1.92	1.20	S
75	understandable-baffling	1.52	1.24	1.32	1.12	1.70	1.23	1.34	1.10	F
76	responsible-not responsible	2.36	1.25	2.39	1.26	2.11	1.25	2.17	1.30	S
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.38	1.22	1.45	1.28	0.70	0.93	0.84	0.94	S
78	sympathy-indifference	1.77	1.19	1.77	1.27	1.21	1.07	1.28	1.14	S
79	expected-unexpected	1.83	1.10	1.72	1.01	2.06	1.17	1.88	1.01	S
80	hopeful-hopeless	1.66	1.04	1.76	1.08	1.61	1.09	1.58	1.09	
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION									
81	bad-good	2.11	1.11	1.75	1.25	2.11	1.10	2.11	1.30	F
82	understanding-indifferent	1.51	1.12	1.61	1.29	1.33	1.06	1.40	1.13	S
83	suspicious-trusting	1.66	0.96	1.74	1.07	1.79	1.02	1.91	1.02	
84	safe-unsafe	1.85	1.12	2.07	1.21	2.00	1.18	2.02	1.20	
85	disturbed-undisturbed	1.87	1.18	1.64	1.26	1.62	1.25	1.51	1.24	
86	justified-unjustified	1.75	0.93	1.74	1.19	1.66	0.95	1.44	1.01	S
87	tense-calm	2.02	1.18	1.77	1.18	1.73	1.13	1.71	1.08	S
88	hate-love	2.12	0.78	1.91	0.87	2.11	0.66	2.12	0.74	F
89	wrong-right	2.10	0.98	1.96	1.14	2.12	0.99	2.26	1.13	
90	humorous-serious	2.63	1.12	3.11	0.95	2.97	1.09	3.38	0.76	F, S

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete anova tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

TABLE 2

Means,* Standard Deviations and Results of Analyses of Variance
(continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) MEAN	MALE FORM A(*N*=342) S.D.	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) MEAN	MALE FORM B(*N*=336) S.D.	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) MEAN	FEMALE FORM A(*N*=225) S.D.	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) MEAN	FEMALE FORM B(*N*=211) S.D.	DIFFERENCES SIGNIFICANT AT .01***
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING									
91	fearful-secure	2.63	1.11	2.12	1.21	2.50	1.18	1.88	1.31	F
92	tolerable-intolerable	1.04	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.04	1.15	1.02	1.07	
93	hostile-indifferent	3.04	1.06	2.86	1.06	2.91	1.14	2.93	1.04	
94	important-trivial	3.09	1.07	2.81	1.18	3.14	1.05	2.86	1.16	F
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	1.56	1.26	1.21	1.22	1.38	1.34	0.90	1.16	F, S
96	calm-anxious	1.38	1.28	1.87	1.32	1.64	1.35	1.97	1.35	F
97	indignant-understanding	2.88	1.08	2.65	1.05	2.86	1.13	2.77	0.95	F
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	2.24	1.31	2.40	1.29	2.56	1.31	2.60	1.28	S
99	hate-love	2.10	0.69	2.07	0.74	2.13	0.74	2.22	0.68	
100	not resentful-resentful	1.04	1.16	1.10	1.11	1.15	1.24	0.94	1.08	

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete anova tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.